Obama, McCain and the Bush Legacy - Part 1

Published On : November 6, 2008

Last Updated : October 4, 2024

Purpose Of This Series, My Political Neutrality, Citizen Of God's Kingdom, The Coming Kingdom Of God On Earth, I'm Not A Jehovah's Witness, Who I Am, Lying Frauds And False Prophets, Corrupt Modern Politics, Smooth-Talking "Career Politicians", No Real Political Choice For Christians, Lesser Of Two Evils? Obama And McCain Both Bad Christian Choices, Being Right On A Few Issues Doesn't Make A Good President, George Bush Mess, Bush Legacy, Two Prolonged Wars, American War Toll On Iraqis, America's Wars & Islamic Terrorism - Neither Is Justifiable, Biblical Teaching On War And Peace, Extraordinary Rendition, Bush Illegally Spied On American Citizens, US Rights Crushed, USA's Nuclear Hypocrisy, New Arms Race?, Preemptive Strikes, New Cold War?, Regime Change, America Exports Violence & War, Bush's Haughty "My Way" Attitude, America Hated And Despised, George Bush's Social Record, World Gripped In Economic Crash

As I conclude writing this new series, a new day dawns in the United States of America; not only in a physical sense -- it is just after 12:00 PM November the 5th, on the East Coast of the USA -- but in a political sense as well -- the eight-year long mantle of the Republican Party has just been cast to the ground by a disenfranchised American public. Laying claim to a strong mandate, Barack Hussein Obama has just been chosen as the 44th president, and as the very first Black president, of that nation, in an electoral vote landslide of 349 to 147, with three states, North Carolina, Georgia and Missouri, yet to be decided.

My hope was to try to complete this series several days ago, so that the counsel which I have written herein might have a more direct effect on the outcome of the election. However, it appears that I started writing it a little too late, and I became more involved in the details than I had originally anticipated. Be that as it may, it is my hope that whether

you voted or not, you will still take the time to read this series; and that upon doing this, it will motivate you to reflect upon the decisions that you may have made on this most historic American election day. If you happen to be a citizen of another country, and are observing the American election campaign from afar, then I hope that you too will derive some benefit from reading the following series.

As some of my regular readers will already be aware, I am neither a Republican, nor a Democrat, nor an Independent. I did not support Senator Barack Obama or Senator John McCain, in the current presidential campaign. As I point out in my article "The Heavenly Vision: Have You Got It?", I have for many years now viewed myself first and foremost as a citizen of God's Kingdom; and my allegiance is to that Kingdom; and I will only promote that Kingdom. I won't support, promote, or vote in any political system invented by man, because it is my personal belief that every single one of said systems is corrupt, imperfect, inefficient, and ultimately doomed to failure. In fact, as I've explained a number of times before in several of my articles, the Bible plainly tells us that all of the governments of the world will someday be replaced by a literal Kingdom of God on Earth, ruled by none other than Jesus Christ Himself, the Rock from Heaven, as we see in these example verses:

"Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshingfloors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth . . . And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever."
Daniel 2:34-35, 44, KJV

"I will declare the decree: the LORD hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt

break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel."
Psalm 2:7-9, KJV

"And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations: And he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken to shivers: even as I received of my Father."
Revelation 2:26-27, KJV

"And she brought forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto God, and to his throne."
Revelation 12:5, KJV

"And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS."
Revelation 19:11-16, KJV

"Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven."
Matthew 6:10, KJV

For more on the topic of the coming literal Kingdom of God, please refer to articles such as "From Armageddon to the New Earth".

Now, to those of you who may get the impression that I am a Jehovah's Witness because I do not participate in the voting system, let me state plainly that I am in no way associated with that organization whatsoever. While I concur with some of their doctrines, they have certain beliefs with which I am in strong disagreement. As sincere as their members may

be, it is my personal view that they are deceived by their leaders, and their interpretation of the Bible regarding some issues. There are plenty of websites which are devoted to exposing the errors behind the doctrines of the Jehovah Witnesses, if you wish to avail yourself of them. I won't be doing that here, as that is not the focus of this current series.

Just as I am not affiliated with any particular political party or organization, neither am I associated with any Christian church or religious organization. In short, no one is pulling my strings, and I am not pushing anyone's agenda. For over twenty years now, I have been a totally independent, free-thinking Christian evangelist, and nothing more. All of my views are derived from my years of personal Bible study, and my understanding of God's Word. I am not a prophet, or a faith healer, or anything of the like. I am just one man who is trying to understand God's Word, just like everyone else. And yes, I am fallible. I don't claim to know it all, or to understand it all, and you will never ever hear me say "Thus saith the Lord" like so many modern-day "wannabe prophets", some of whom are eventually exposed for the lying frauds and deceivers that they are.

But returning to the fallibility of human political systems, whether it's communism, capitalism, socialism, dictatorship, or any other form of human government, as I've already said, it's doomed to eventual failure, because it's the creation of mortal, imperfect men. Power and popularity is an extremely lethal mixture; and no matter how honest, upright and fair a politician may try to be, far and in between is the man, or woman, who will not yield to, and be corrupted by them. This is clearly evident by the political scandals which fill the mass media on a regular basis. Some politicians become so powerful, that they fool themselves into thinking that they can get away with anything, and that no one will ever find out. They become deceived into thinking that they are above the law. A lot of them do get away with it, but a few are eventually caught.

No matter how true to their causes and promises a politician may try to be, eventually, many of them reach a point where what becomes most important to them, is not what is right and beneficial for the people who elected them, but rather what is necessary in order for them to remain in office. In

other words, they become career politicians; and holding on to their position of power becomes their primary focus; and that is where political compromise, in the form of unethical practices and questionable deals, begins to occur.

As far as I am concerned, Barack Obama and John McCain are no different than the thousands of other politicians that we have seen come and go over the years. They will both smooth talk the masses, and say whatever needs to be said in order to get elected, and they will both ultimately fail to fully keep their word, if elected to the office of the President of the United States of America. This has always been the way of fast-talking politicians. They will say one thing in order to get your vote, and then they will go back on their word, and do something entirely different once they have been elected. In short, they use people, they use you, and they use Christians.

My view is that in this election, as in previous elections, there is no real choice for true Bible-believing Christians. To vote for either candidate, Obama or McCain, will cause us to compromise our Bible-based beliefs in one way or another. Contrary to the belief that is held by some Christians, and which was evident during the previous presidential campaign, there is really no such thing as voting for the lesser of two evils. During the last election cycle, some Christians convinced themselves that voting for George W. Bush was the lesser of two evils. They didn't particularly care for Bush, especially after the lies and deception behind the illegal Iraq invasion began to be exposed; nevertheless, they took the position that anything would be better than electing a person like John Kerry. I wonder if they still feel that way, considering the state of the United States, and the state of the world, today.

Neither of the two current presidential candidates, Obama or McCain, has an agenda which we Christians can or even should fully support. You need to realize that if you decide to vote for a particular candidate simply because they agree with you on a few key issues which are important to us Christians, and they win the election, that means that you've also given them the power, and the freedom, to carry out policies with which you may not agree. Please think about that for a minute.

As I mentioned a moment ago, a primary example of this can be

seen in the victories of George W. Bush during the last eight years. Mr. Bush won two elections by carrying the Christian voting bloc. He couldn't have won without the support of the Christian Right. Many of you reading this voted for Mr. Bush because of his stance regarding abortion, embryonic stem cell research and the gay and lesbian agenda; but look at what the man has done to the USA over the past eight years. If there is one thing that can be learned from this, it is that being right about a few key issues does not a good president make.

As I recently told our mailing list members, I really pity the man who becomes the next president, whether it is Obama or McCain, because George W. Bush has left the USA in such a terrible mess. I think Obama and McCain are both crazy for even wanting the job. The next leader of the USA is going to have so many problems to deal with, which were created by, or which came to a head during, the Bush Administration, that I don't see how he will be able to be an effective president. I imagine this picture of the next president just struggling to the surface, gasping for a gulp of fresh air. If Obama wins, as current political speculations are waging, I am sure that the Republican Party will enjoy watching him struggle. But, on the other hand, if John McCain "miraculously" wins on the 4th of November, the Republican Party won't have anyone but itself to blame, as McCain tries to pull the USA out of its current downward spiral.

Exactly what has the Bush Administration given us? Consider the following, and tell me if these are truly the actions of a God-fearing, Bible-believing, Christian leader and nation. The following, my friends, is the Bush legacy:

The United States is currently engaged in two prolonged wars in which many innocent civilians have lost their lives. We often hear about the 4,000+ American soldiers who have died in Iraq; and we are often reminded of the 3,000+ people who lost their lives during 9/11, (as if this unrelated event somehow justifies the invasion of Iraq); but how often does anyone mention the hundreds of thousands of Iraqi civilians, as well as Afghanis, who have died as a result of American bombing campaigns, or who have been horribly maimed, or who have lost their homes, or who have died from starvation, or who have died due to a lack of medical attention, or who have lost their jobs, as a result of American war efforts?

Iraq's economy, infrastructure, political body and social structure were obliterated during the opening phase of the war. Is it any wonder then that some Muslims and Arabs hate America so much, that they are willing to give their lives in exchange for killing a few Americans? I am by no means condoning these terrible acts of violence, but you do need to understand what motivates these people. Under President Bush, American forces invaded Iraq, convincing the Iraqis that they were bringing them democracy and freedom from the brutal years of Saddam Hussein's rule. Yes, Saddam Hussein is now gone, but the Iraqis have endured over five years of foreign occupation since then, and their nation has still not recovered from America's initial onslaught. As bad as the situation was under Saddam's rule, it is even worse now. The level of violence is much higher, and the country may yet still be torn apart by civil war.

The Bush Administration, and their propaganda machine, the mass media, in their vain effort to maintain support for the Iraq War, are ever so faithful to constantly remind us about those violent, crazy Muslim extremists and suicide bombers, but as Bible-believing, peace-loving Christians, we need to stop and ask ourselves: What makes America's wars any more justified in the eyes of God? War is war, and war is hell on Earth, regardless of what religion happens to be behind it; and according to Jesus' teachings, war is wrong. Consider these sample verses:

"Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."
Matthew 26:52, KJV

"Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence."
John 18:36, KJV

"Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God."
Matthew 5:9, KJV

I am reminded of a scene from the American television movie, "Jesus", starring Jeremy Sisto. In one part, the Devil shows

Jesus a scene where the so-called "Christian Crusaders" are engaging in battle. As they do so, you can hear them say "In the name of Christ!". The Iraq War, and any other war, is no more befitting a so-called Christian nation like the United States, than the Crusades were befitting the Christians of that time period. War, especially the destructive wars which are begun and fought by the United States, is the epitome of Christian hypocrisy, and totally contrary to the teachings of Jesus Christ, as can be seen by the previous verses. What makes the Iraq War even worse in my view, is the fact that it was thrust upon the American people through outright lying and deception. There were no WMD. Again I ask: Are these the actions of a truly Christian president?

Consider some of the other points which have characterized the Bush Administration:

George W. Bush purposely, and secretly, condoned the setting up of foreign interrogation and torture camps that are beyond the reach of American law. Bush did this because he knew that he couldn't get away with doing it on American soil. This policy is known as "extraordinary rendition". Investigate it.

George W. Bush has illegally spied on American citizens for years through wire-tapping, through email sniffing programs such as Carnivore, and by other methods. Through fear and paranoia, he has used 9/11, the Patriot Act, and other bills and executive orders, to trample upon the rights of American citizens with impunity. By his very actions, he appears to consider himself above the law.

While the U.S. Government condemns other nations for their interest in acquiring nuclear weapons, and actively works to prevent other nations from acquiring nuclear technology, (as is evident from the highly-publicized news concerning North Korea and Iran), as has been reported in the American news media since 2007, the U.S. Government currently has plans to build a new nuclear warhead. The design of this new nuclear warhead has been awarded to the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California, which may draw upon work done by its competitor, Los Alamos Laboratory, in the state of New Mexico.

Taking into consideration the fact that plutonium pits have a life span of at least eighty-five years or more, we should

all question why a new nuclear warhead is even necessary. Of course, it is rather obvious that other nuclear powers, such as Russia and China, are not just going to stand idly by as America upgrades its nuclear capabilities. Thus, we may now be seeing the beginning of a new nuclear arms race, due to the belligerent attitude of the Bush Administration.

Let us also not forget that this is the same country that dropped nuclear bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, resulting in over 330,000 deaths and injuries in less than a week's time, most of them being civilians. As is common knowledge, the U.S.A. is the possessor of one of the largest nuclear stockpiles in the entire world. Due to the obvious secrecy maintained by the government, the exact number of nuclear warheads possessed by the American Government is unknown; however, the Wikipedia website states the following:

----- Begin Quote -----

The exact number of nuclear weapons possessed by the United States is difficult to determine. Different treaties and organizations have different criteria for reporting nuclear weapons, especially those held in reserve, and those being dismantled or rebuilt:

* As of 1999, the U.S. was said to have 12,000 nuclear weapons of all types stockpiled.

* In its Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) declaration for 2003, the U.S. listed 5,968 deployed warheads as defined by START rules.

* For 2007, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists listed the U.S. with about 5,400 total nuclear warheads: around 3,575 strategic and 500 nonstrategic warheads; and about 1,260 additional warheads held in the inactive stockpile. Other warheads are in some step of the disassembly process.

In 2002, the United States and Russia agreed in the SORT treaty to reduce their deployed stockpiles to not more than 2,200 warheads each. In 2003, the US rejected Russian proposals to further reduce both nation's nuclear stockpiles to 1,500 each.

----- End Quote -----

It is also interesting to note that the 1996 Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, or CTBT, which bans all nuclear explosions in all environments, for military or civilian purposes, has never been ratified by the Government of the United States of America. According to information found on the Wikipedia website:

----- Begin Quote -----

The CTBT has now been signed by 180 states and ratified by 145. On 16 January 2007, Moldova ratified the CTBT, completing the ratification of the treaty by all the states of Europe. India and Pakistan, though not nuclear weapons states as defined by the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), did not sign; neither did the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea). India and Pakistan conducted back-to-back nuclear tests in 1998, while North Korea withdrew from the NPT in 2003 and tested a nuclear device in 2006. Fifteen other states have not signed. The treaty will enter into force 180 days after the 44 states listed in Annex 2 of the treaty have ratified it. Nine of these have not yet done so, including two nuclear weapon states under the NPT (the United States and the People's Republic of China) as well as all four states outside the NPT (India, Pakistan, Israel and North Korea).

----- End Quote -----

It is interesting to note that much of the resistance to the aforementioned treaties has occurred under George W. Bush. Isn't it being rather hypocritical for Bush to be pointing the finger at North Korea and Iran, when his administration has refused for eight years now, to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty? Equally alarming, and as was widely reported by the American mass media, President Bush publicly stated that he would consider a preemptive strike against another nation. In his June 1, 2002 speech before the cadets of West Point, George W. Bush stated in part:

----- Begin Quote -----

We cannot defend America and our friends by hoping for the best. We cannot put our faith in the word of tyrants, who

solemnly sign non-proliferation treaties, and then systemically break them. If we wait for threats to fully materialize, we will have waited too long – Our security will require transforming the military you will lead – a military that must be ready to strike at a moment's notice in any dark corner of the world. And our security will require all Americans to be forward-looking and resolute, to be ready for preemptive action when necessary to defend our liberty and to defend our lives.

----- End Quote -----

In later speeches, George W. Bush further expanded upon his so-called "Bush Doctrine", by declaring that that the United States has the right to act unilaterally in its own security interests, without the approval of international bodies such as the United Nations. In short, George Bush stuck his nose up at the world, which is one of the primary reasons why the United States is now so hated around the world. While he has talked all about respecting the "rule of law", under Bush's leadership, the United States has defied International Law, and international opinion, and declared that it will do as it pleases, regardless of what anyone else thinks.

As a result of "The Bush Doctrine", other nations have since made similar declarations regarding preemptive strikes. In short, George W. Bush has really done nothing to advance the cause of peace around the world. Bush's actions and attitude have only filled the world with more uncertainty, paranoia, and fear. As retired Air Force Lt. Colonel Buzz Patterson sadly stated in 2007, the USA appears to be heading towards another Cold War with Russia, thanks to "The Bush Doctrine".

In a June, 2001 New York Times article, after President Bush had made known his intentions to abandon the Antiballistic Missile Treaty of 1972 in order to build his missile shield, then Russian president, Vladimir Putin, (who is now Russian Prime Minister), made the following remarks, which clearly reveal that a new nuclear arms race has in fact already been in progress for the past seven years. Thus, Patterson was in essence speaking after-the-fact:

----- Begin Quote -----

"When we hear statements that the programs would go with us

or without us, well, we cannot force anyone to do the things we would like them to," he said. "We offer our cooperation. We offer to work jointly. If there is no need that such joint work is needed, well, suit yourself."

However, Mr. Putin added, "we stand ready" to respond to any unilateral American action, even though Russia does not see an immediate threat from a missile shield.

"I am confident that at least for the coming 25 years" American missile defenses "will not cause any substantial damage to the national security of Russia," he said. But he added, "We will reinforce our capability" by "mounting multiple warheads on our missiles" and "that will cost us a meager sum." And so, he said, "the nuclear arsenal of Russia will be augmented multifold."

He said both the Start I and Start II treaties would be negated by an American decision to build missile defenses in violation of the Antiballistic Missile Treaty of 1972. Such a step would eliminate verification and inspection requirements, he said, reviving an era in which Russia would hide its abilities and intentions.

----- End Quote -----

While the US Government claims that it is for peace, freedom and democracy, it secretly foments violence, revolution and war in foreign nations, in order to topple governments which are not supportive of America's global objectives. Clinton and Bush have referred to this as "regime change", as if the USA is the policeman of the world and has some "divine right" to do this. Such was the case with the CIA-supported attempt to overthrow President Hugo Chavez of Venezuela, (it failed), the downfall of Slobodan Milosevic of Yugoslavia, the ouster of Saddam Hussein of Iraq, etc., and the Shi'ite mullahs of Iran will probably be next.

In addition to the USA's covert attempts to stir up trouble around the world, it is also an indisputable fact that the U.S. Government earns billions of dollars every single year through the sale and export of weapons of war to foreign governments. Military sales are in fact the most profitable foreign business venture of the American Government. Is this really exporting peace, freedom and democracy? Is this what

real Christians do? If you voted for Bush, then you helped to support all of the unscrupulous activities of the Bush Administration.

As I mentioned a moment ago, George W. Bush has snubbed his nose at the rest of the world when it has come to important global issues, whether it is arms control treaties, or other important issues, such as Global Warming. Since George Bush assumed the presidency, his administration has adamantly and repeatedly refused to ratify the Kyoto Protocol. Bush just doesn't seem to care what anyone thinks, and he certainly doesn't care about the environment. Bush's actions over the past eight years clearly reveal that his allegiance belongs to his rich oil, gas and coal friends, and to other leaders of Big Business and the elite clan to which he belongs.

As I have noted a number of times before, as a direct result of Bush's haughty attitude, his blatant war-mongering, and his unilateralist policies, the U.S.A. has become more hated and despised around the world than it has ever been before. Sadly, Mr. Bush continues to push forward his programs and policies through fear, paranoia and intimidation. Just dare to disagree with him and his cohorts, and you'll be branded as being unpatriotic. There is no room for dissent under George W. Bush . . . or is that freedom of speech?

What about social issues? Jesus and the Bible teach us that pure religion, and true Christianity, is to help the needy, to assist the downtrodden, to comfort the afflicted, and to lighten the burden of those who are oppressed. Has George W. Bush met this requirement as the Christian that he claims to be? Sadly, his public record leaves a lot of room for doubt.

During the past eight years of the Bush Administration, the situation has only gotten worse for the poor, for the sick, for the elderly, for working class families, and for young people who are interested in obtaining a higher education. Furthermore, George W. Bush, and the greedy money-mongers who pull his strings, are responsible for the current global economic meltdown which has only made other nations hate the USA all the more. Banking institutions and businesses large and small are failing the world over like a row of dominoes, as their national governments try to prop them up through any means possible. Trillions of dollars have already been pumped into the global economy, in an effort to stabilize

it, but will it work? Thus far, the answer has been "No!".

At this moment, hundreds of thousands of American citizens are losing their jobs as the recession deepens, and the U.S. economy shrinks. A lot of people are also being forced out of their homes and off of their farms. Large businesses and small family-run businesses are also being forced to declare bankruptcy. The sick and the elderly are having a difficult time getting their medical needs met. Life savings are just disappearing between people's fingers resulting in great despair. Many students are losing hope of ever being able to attend college. This same scenario is playing out in other parts of the world as well, and economists are saying that we haven't yet seen the bottom of this economic downward spiral. In fact, some of them are now saying that it will be years before the global economy fully recovers, thanks to "good" old American greed.

Please go to part two for the continuation of this series.

Written by Bill Kochman

wordweaver777@gmail.com
https://www.billkochman.com

Obama, McCain and the Bush Legacy - Part 2

Published On : November 6, 2008

Last Updated : October 4, 2024

Bush's Tax Breaks To The Rich, $ Billions In Foreign Bribes, America's Infidel Leaders, Has Voting For G. Bush Paid Off?, George W. Bush's Record On Roe v. Wade, Conservative Judges, Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act, Child Custody Protection Act Prominent Abortion Supporters, Vanessa Cullin's "Draconian", Tactic - Break Parental Bond & Isolate Child To Make Money, Sheldon Turkish Says Nothing But Some Tissue, Psalm 139:16, Abortion Still The Law Of The Land, Sex Education & Condoms, Parental Notification And Consent Issues, Abort But No Vote,

Bush's View On Sanctity Of Heterosexual Marriage, Genesis, Gay & Lesbian Activists Get Huge Victories During Bush Term, California Connecticut Massachusetts Legalize Gay "Marriage", Dark Evil Tide Over America, Gays Are Activists Not Pacifist, American School System Is Targeted By Gay And Lesbian Agenda, Contend For The Faith, Spineless Congress Repeatedly Fails To Pass Gay "Marriage" Ban Amendment, Bush Term Was Ineffective, Bush's Record On Embryonic Stem Cell Research, Controversy

Continuing our discussion from part one, ironically, while millions of American citizens across the USA find themselves financially challenged and just struggling to survive, George W. Bush has approved tax breaks which will only benefit the extremely rich. At the same time, the U.S. Government spends billions of dollars annually on its foreign war efforts, and billions more in the form of annual bribes, in order to keep certain countries under the American sphere of influence. So we must ask ourselves "What about the people at home? Where do they come into the picture?" The Bible plainly teaches us:

"But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel."
1 Timothy 5:8, KJV

This Biblical principle applies on a national level as well. By taking care of his rich friends through tax breaks, and wasting billions of dollars on foreign wars, and supporting foreign governments through billions of dollars spent in annual bribes, while at the same time ignoring and denying the needs of the American people, and in fact, making their situation worse, is it possible that Bush and his cronies are infidels, according to the Biblical definition?

As I mentioned earlier, many conservative Christians voted for George W. Bush because of his position regarding three key issues which are of importance to us Christians. These issues are abortion, embryonic stem cell research, and the gay and lesbian agenda. So the big question in my mind is this: If you voted for Bush, did your investment pay off? Do you honestly believe that your vote during the last two elections really counted for something? Did your vote make a substantial difference, particularly in light of all of the

negative things which have occurred during the past eight years? In other words, do you believe that the good done by the Bush Administration has outweighed the bad? Well, let's examine these three areas, and then you decide.

George W. Bush has had eight full years to put an end to Roe v. Wade, (legally known as 410 U.S. 113), the 1973 US Supreme Court ruling that legalized abortion by overturning all state and federal laws that outlawed or restricted abortion, based upon its holding. While the Federal Government has not been successful at totally nullifying Roe v. Wade, some successes towards this goal during the Bush Administration are worthy of note. In fact, it is evident that the Conservative Right has chosen to take a steady, incremental approach in order to eventually defeat the Roe v. Wade ruling.

For example, George Bush's appointment of some conservative judges to the US Supreme Court has undoubtedly had a direct effect on the legal status of abortion in the USA. In one of its more recent decisions, in April of 2007, by a vote of 5 to 4, the Supreme Court put its weight behind and upheld the highly controversial Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. As you may recall, this bill was passed by the U.S. Congress, and signed into law by President Bush in November of 2003. This important piece of legislation makes it a crime for doctors to perform any "overt act" to "kill the partially delivered living fetus". Those who violate this law may face criminal prosecution, fines and up to two years in prison. It is important to note that President Bill Clinton vetoed this same law twice during his term in office.

In addition to his controversial Supreme Court appointments, during his tenure as president, George W. Bush has appointed sixty-one conservative-leaning judges to the federal appeals courts. This court system is comprised of thirteen circuits, of which ten are controlled by Republican-appointed judges, according to an October 2008 article in the New York Times. During his term in office, President Bill Clinton appointed sixty-five judges to the federal appeals courts. It has been estimated that the number of federal judges appointed by the Republican Party, most of them conservative, will have risen about twelve per cent, from fifty per cent to sixty-two per cent, since George W. Bush first took office. The movement to advance a "conservative legal revolution" actually began during the Reagan Administration.

Just over two years ago in 2006, the Child Custody Protection Act, (a.k.a. the Child Interstate Abortion Notification Act), was amended to title 18 of the Federal Criminal Code; or the United States Code, as it is also known. This bill makes it a crime for a doctor to perform or to induce an abortion on an out-of-state minor in violation of parental notification requirements. The act also requires that a physician give a twenty-four hour actual or constructive notice to a parent of the minor seeking an abortion. Violators of this act are subject to a fine, and could spend up to a year behind bars as well. However, as passed, this bill does allow for an exception if:

1) the physician complies with parental notification requirements in the physician's state;

2) the physician is given documentation that a court in the minor's state of residence has waived parental notification or otherwise authorized the minor's abortion;

3) the minor provides a written statement that she is the victim of sexual abuse, neglect, or physical abuse by a parent and the physician notifies appropriate state officials of such abuse;

4) the abortion is necessary to save the life of the minor (written notice must be given to the minor's parent within 24 hours after the lifesaving abortion is performed): or

5) a person accompanying the minor provides documentation to the physician that such person is the parent of the minor.

As you can see, this act is not bullet-proof, and does allow for legal loopholes. But there is more. While these two acts do make it more difficult for a minor to obtain an abortion, they don't make it entirely impossible for them to do so. The reason for this is simple; and that is because abortion laws differ from state to state. At this current time, there are forty-four states that have abortion laws which require that a minor's parents be involved in the decision-making process. However, the level of parental involvement varies. The level of parental involvement can be broken down as follows:

a. In twelve states, a minor can obtain an abortion

without parental consent; however, she is required to notify at least one of her parents ahead of time regarding her decision. The one exception is the state of Minnesota, where both parents are required to be notified of the girl's decision to have an abortion.

b. In twenty-three states, a minor cannot obtain an abortion unless she first acquires parental consent from one parent. The exception to this are, I believe, Mississippi, North Dakota and Texas, where the consent of both parents is required before an abortion can be granted to a minor.

c. In two states, Oklahoma and Utah, parental consent and parental notification must both be provided before an abortion can be performed on a minor.

d. In nine states, the situation is rather nebulous, as parental involvement laws have either been blocked by a particular court order, or else they are simply not being properly enforced.

e. Tragically, there are six states where there are no laws concerning parental involvement. These are Vermont, Connecticut, New York, Washington, Oregon, and Hawaii. Also included in this group is the District of Columbia.

As if the situation isn't already loose enough, as we saw a moment ago, in some situations, the Child Custody Protection Act does allow judges to issue court orders which permit a girl to obtain an abortion even without her parents' consent. For example, in the state of West Virginia, a physician who can demonstrate that he/she has no financial attachments to the abortion provider, can perform an abortion on a minor. There are likewise some states where it is acceptable for grandparents, or other family members, to be involved in a minor's choice to have an abortion, instead of the parents.

While the state of Mississippi has very strict anti-abortion laws, so that only one abortion clinic has managed to survive there, (at least legally), it is obviously not the only state where the abortion war is being waged. In March of 2006, two-term Governor Michael Rounds of South Dakota signed into law a bill which made it a felony to perform an abortion, unless it could be proved that it was absolutely necessary in order

to save a woman's life. The general consensus in both camps was that the purpose of the South Dakota law was to challenge Roe v. Wade head-on. As was expected, abortion proponents went on the attack, and the law was ultimately repealed by a voter referendum in November of that same year. However, the battle is not over there just yet. On November 4, 2008, voters will have an opportunity to accept or reject a new amendment which would ban abortion except in the case of rape, incest or when there is a serious health threat to the mother.

While I have used the phrase "abortion proponents", at this point in our discussion, it would be good to identify some of the people and organizations which have publicly come out in favor of abortion, and have defended it to some degree. These include, but are not limited to the following:

American Civil Liberties Union
Center for Reproductive Rights
Former President William Jefferson Clinton
Former Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor
Former Vice President Al Gore
Guttmacher Institute (former division of Planned Parenthood)
Nancy Pelosi, Speaker of the House, Democrat of California
Naral Pro-Choice America
National Organization for Women
Planned Parenthood Federation of America
President-elect Barack Hussein Obama
Senator Barbara Boxer, Democrat of California
Senator Dianne Feinstein, Democrat of California
Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton, Democrat of New York
Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy
Supreme Court Justice David Souter
Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens
Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg
Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer
Vice President-elect Joseph Biden

One comment I came across while conducting research for this series, which I found rather disturbing, was made by Doctor Vanessa Cullins, who currently serves as vice president for medical affairs for Planned Parenthood Federation of America. In a statement, this woman made a remark regarding how, in her opinion, "draconian parental notification laws endanger the health of young women".

Are we then to simply trust that young teenaged girls, who are obviously already under stress due to their situation, and still minors, actually have the wisdom, as well as the maturity, that's needed to make such an important decision on their own, without any input whatsoever from their wiser parents? I think not. Obviously, some of these minor girls are fearful that their mistake will be discovered; and then not only will they suffer embarrassment, but they'll have to face their parents' disappointment and anger as well. But, in many cases, while the parents may not approve of what the child has done by getting pregnant, they will offer the girl the comfort, understanding and support that she will need at such a time, and they will encourage the girl to keep the child, even if it is only to offer it up for adoption later on. Isn't this better than murderous abortion? I think so.

The problem is that some of these abortionists don't want to allow this to happen. These unscrupulous baby killers know how vulnerable a young pregnant girl can be; and they also realize that the minor may not go through with the abortion, (meaning the abortion clinic will lose money), if the child has any opportunity to consult with her parents first. Thus, it seems to me that their goal is to break the parental bond when it comes to the all important issue of abortion. They want to isolate the child, and in fact replace the parents, and substitute their opinion, for the parents' opinion. Of course, they will comfort the girl prior to the abortion; but once the deed has been done, it's done, and it most certainly cannot be reversed; and the child will have the rest of her life to regret her decision, while the abortion clinic goes on its merry way, and continues to turn a profit.

I am reminded of another cold-hearted statement from a case which made the news towards the end of 2002. It involved one gynecologist/abortionist in the state of New Jersey by the name of Sheldon Turkish, and a woman named Rosa Acuna. News reports state that Ms. Acuna sued the abortionist, because at the time of her abortion in 1996, he failed to inform her that aborting a baby in the first trimester was in reality terminating the life of a human being. According to Acuna, when she asked Turkish whether or not a baby was already in her womb, he responded that it was "nothing but some blood." This deceptive abortionist in fact admitted in depositions, that he informs pregnant women that there is "nothing but some tissue". Sadly, this is the attitude of many of these

cold-blooded, licensed killers. Thankfully, this is not how God views a fetus or an embryo. He sees us as real, living human beings, even before we are conceived or born. As I've pointed out before, in Psalm 139, we find the following enlightening verse:

"Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them."
Psalm 139:16, KJV

In conclusion, in spite of President Bush's personal position regarding abortion, and despite the fact that he succeeded in appointing conservative-leaning judges to the Supreme Court, as well as to many courts of appeal, legalized abortion still remains the law of the land, and surely, this is to our shame. Furthermore, to this day, a woman retains full control over her body when it comes to the issue of abortion. Under normal conditions, neither her spouse, boyfriend, or anyone else, can override her personal decision to obtain an abortion.

To make matters worse, we now have sex education occurring in the American public school system, when this is something which should be taught at home. To add insult to injury, it is also now common practice for some schools to make condoms available to their students. In my view, this practice only adds to the problem of sexual promiscuity, which in itself increases the opportunity for abortions to occur.

Sadly, this is not all. As a result of the current status of abortion laws in some states, a teenaged pregnant girl can now receive counseling at school, without her parents even being notified about it. Abortion supporters claim that this is a privacy issue, even though the girl is still a minor, and her parents are legally responsible for her. As we saw earlier, in some states, a pregnant minor can not only get counseling regarding her pregnancy, but she can proceed to have an abortion without her parents' consent, or without their being notified, or without both. I find it rather odd that this same minor is not old enough to vote, and yet she is deemed wise enough to make a decision regarding abortion, which will terminate the life of another human being. Surely, this is the epitome of hypocrisy and madness.

While some of these developments did not begin during the Bush years, they have been further advanced during the Bush Administration, in spite of all that Bush has said and done. The question then is this: Do you personally believe that George W. Bush did all that he could possibly do insofar as the abortion issue is concerned, during his eight years in office? Or do you think that Bush allowed politics to get in the way and that he could have done more? Should Roe v. Wade have been overturned after eight years of Republican rule?

Let's move on to the next issue. Publicly, George W. Bush has stated that he views marriage as a sacred union between a man and a woman. In his 2004 State of the Union address, Mr. Bush said the following regarding judges who were going against the conservative grain, and proceeding to rule in favor of legalizing gay and lesbian "marriages":

----- Begin Quote -----

". . . if judges insist on forcing their arbitrary will upon the people, the only alternative left to the people would be the constitutional process."

----- End Quote -----

Several weeks later, in February of 2004, President George W. Bush reiterated his position regarding the gay and lesbian "marriage" issue, with the following statement:

----- Begin Quote -----

"Marriage is a sacred institution between a man and a woman . . . If activist judges insist on re-defining marriage by court order, the only alternative will be the constitutional process. We must do what is legally necessary to defend the sanctity of marriage."

----- End Quote -----

Based on statements like the previous ones, many Christians voted for George W. Bush, not once, but twice, believing that the president would do his best to protect this God-ordained, and God-blessed institution. As we read in the very first book of the Bible, Genesis:

"So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth."
Genesis 1:27-28, KJV

"And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh."
Genesis 2:23-24, KJV

Sadly, it has become evident to many Christians, that in the past eight years during Bush's tenure as president, the gay and lesbian activists have not only grown much stronger, and more organized, and more vocal with their demands, but they have also obtained their most significant victories to date. As you will undoubtedly already realize, I am referring to the tragic fact that three states, (California, Connecticut, and Massachusetts), have now legalized gay "marriages"; and I have no doubt that other states will follow suit in coming months and years, motivated in large part by the financial incentive that is provided by legalizing gay "marriages".

The battle between the Conservative Right and the Liberal Left is currently at a high pitch. As I write these words, in less than twenty-four hours, voters in three US states, California, Florida and Arizona, will hold referendums, in order to determine whether or not amendments will be added to their state constitutions, in order to ban these gay and lesbian "marriages". While we can all hope for the best, as a realist, and one who studies God's Word, I sense that a dark, evil tide is slowly rolling over the American land; and soon, many more cities and states will be engulfed by it, to the chagrin of conservative, God-fearing people.

While they blatantly deny it, the supporters and promoters of the gay and lesbian agenda are indeed radicals. While they claim that they just wish to be left alone in order to live their lives as they please, this is the furthest thing from the truth. It is an undeniable fact that these people

have been making concerted efforts to see to it that their sinful lifestyle is accepted by American society at large. This is evidenced by the fact that this social disease has now spread to not only American television networks, as well as to the movie industry, and to the music industry, and is on display in public "gay pride" parades, but sadly, it has also found its way into the American public school system.

In case you have not yet been made aware of this development, in some states, young elementary school children can now find books in their library, which try to teach them that gay and lesbian relationships are another alternative and acceptable lifestyle. These damnable books teach young, impressionable children, who obviously have very little wisdom and spiritual discernment, that while some families have one mommy and one daddy, others have two mommies or two daddies; and according to the authors of these books, this is perfectly fine. As a Christian parent, it should absolutely anger you that these gay and lesbian radicals have the audacity to target the most vulnerable members of American society.

If you are a Christian parent, and if you discover that your child's school offers these kind of books to their students, I hope that you will demonstrate Christian courage, and take the steps that are necessary in order to reverse this awful trend. As the Apostle Jude wrote, we must be willing to stand up for, or contend, for our Christian faith:

"Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."
Jude 1:3, KJV

The sad thing about this current situation, is that it could have been halted years ago. It is a matter of public record, that when the Senate was in a position, not once, but twice, to put an abrupt end to the legalization of gay and lesbian "marriages", it failed to do so. In 2004, when the proposed amendment came before the US Senate, it failed to pass by a slim margin of 48 to 50. Two years later, in 2006, a similar amendment failed to pass in the Senate by a vote of 49 to 48. They weren't even able to obtain a bare majority on such an important issue. What you may find interesting regarding the latter of the two votes, is that John McCain was one of the

seven Senators who failed to support the gay "marriage" ban amendment. At that time, the Washington Post, among other American news outlets, reported the following:

----- Begin Quote -----

A constitutional amendment to ban same-sex marriage, backed by President Bush and conservative groups, was soundly defeated in the Senate yesterday after proponents failed to persuade a bare majority of all senators to support the measure.

Although most states have acted to prevent same-sex partners from marrying, seven Senate Republicans were wary of wading into the politically risky issue and voted against bringing the proposed amendment to a final vote.

But Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), who opposed the measure, said: "Most Americans are not yet convinced that their elected representatives or the judiciary are likely to expand decisively the definition of marriage to include same-sex couples."

----- End Quote -----

As I commented to our mailing list members at the time, in my view, the failure to pass this amendment exposed the soft-bellied, career politicians who run Washington, DC. They are more interested in keeping their high-paying jobs, than they are in standing up for what is true and right in the eyes of God. They bowed to political correctness. As to John McCain, he was obviously dead wrong. I wonder what he has to say for himself, now that three states have legalized these ungodly relationships. Perhaps John McCain isn't as conservative as you think he is, and is just playing for your vote.

So, when all is said and done, despite his personal stance concerning the gay and lesbian agenda, and in spite of his efforts to expand the influence of the conservative base via the judiciary system, George W. Bush hasn't really been all that effective at slowing down or stopping this ungodly tide. We Christians have lost some serious ground when it comes to the issue of legalized gay and lesbian "marriages". We've all watched and waited for these two scourges, (abortion and gay "marriages"), to be eliminated for the past eight years, but

it simply has not happened. So again, the question arises: Do you honestly feel that George W. Bush delivered on your expectations of him? Did he make your vote really count? Or do you feel that you were duped again by yet another shrewd political fast-talker who knew how to yank your strings, in order to obtain your vote?

The third key issue which was used to garner the support of the Christian voting bloc, was embryonic stem cell research. As you may recall, early on, George W. Bush publicly stated that he was strongly opposed to the practice of artificially developing embryos, for the purpose of extracting their stem cells for medical research. As you should already know, this immoral, unethical practice results in the immediate death of the days-old embryos, which are the beginnings of new human life. However, after he won the 2000 election, Bush began to soften in his position by August of 2001. At that time, Bush reached a compromise, whereby he didn't totally put an end to embryonic stem cell research, but rather, he placed serious limitations on the embryonic stem cell lines which were still available at the time. He also refused to make Federal funds available for the continuation of said research. A New York Times article from the first week of September of 2001, (just a week prior to 9/11), reveals how Mr. Bush had already begun to weaken in his position, which came as a big surprise, and disappointment, to many conservative thinkers:

----- Begin Quote -----

Mr. Bush struck a careful compromise that he said would encourage potentially lifesaving research but discourage experiments on human embryos, which are destroyed in stem cell experiments. He confined public financing to work on those stem cell colonies, or lines, created before 9 p.m. on Aug. 9 — the moment he announced his decision to the nation in a televised speech.

For his part, Mr. Bush is determined not to let his delicate stem cell compromise unravel. He has vowed to veto any legislation that goes beyond the parameters he specified.

That the discussion is occurring at all, however, reflects how much the public discourse on embryonic stem cell research has changed in a short time. Lawmakers, patients, scientists and bioethicists all say they are struck by how

far Mr. Bush has moved the debate.

"By virtue of his speech, President Bush has fundamentally declared that it is ethical not only to do this research but to fund this research," said R. Alta Charo, a professor of law and medicine at the University of Wisconsin. "So the debate has shifted from whether the research is ethical to a debate about how to go about it. That is a profound shift."

Opponents of stem cell studies are deeply troubled by this shift, but they say it seems inevitable that the federal government will pay for some stem cell research.

Mr. Bush's decision has no effect on research in the private sector. The real issue, said Harold E. Varmus, president of Memorial Sloan- Kettering Cancer Center and a former director of the National Institutes of Health, is not the quality or number of lines, but the fact that scientists cannot use federal money to study new ones that will be developed with private money.

----- End Quote -----

Please go to part three for the continuation of this series.

Written by Bill Kochman

wordweaver777@gmail.com
https://www.billkochman.com

Obama, McCain and the Bush Legacy - Part 3

Published On : November 6, 2008

Last Updated : October 4, 2024

Bush's Record On Embryonic Stem Cell Research, Controversy, Bush vs Embryonic Stem Cell Research And A Divided Congress, Some Conservative Republicans Who Are Not So Conservative, Preimplantation Genetic Diagnosis, Dr. Yamanaka's Discovery,

Therapeutic Cloning, Nuclear Transfer, De-differentiation, Professor Ian Wilmut Changes Course, Stemagen Controversy, Exaggerated Promises Behind Embryonic Stem Cell Research, No Cures Or Treatments In Twenty Years, Adult Stem Cell Success

Continuing our discussion from part two, as we saw with abortion and the gay and lesbian agenda, the truth regarding what has happened with embryonic stem cell research during the two terms of the Bush Administration is actually quite different from what you may think. According to information which I have read, at the time that Mr. Bush reached his controversial compromise, some of the available stem cell lines were already becoming unviable. Stated in another way, scientists could no longer use them for stem cell research, and new stem cell lines had to be developed.

From the start, there was a conflict regarding what had been stated by the Bush Administration. For example, in September 2001, in a New York Times article, Tommy G. Thompson, who at the time was the Secretary of Health and Human Services, was quoted as saying, "They're diverse, they're robust, they're viable for research". Yet in that very same article, critics of the Bush compromise shot back with the following:

----- Begin Quote -----

"But that assertion is being questioned now that more has become known. National Institutes of Health officials, who are preparing a registry that will list the 64 lines and their biological characteristics, now acknowledge that some are in the very early stages of development, and may not prove useful even for basic science. Scientists have used mouse cells to feed the growth of the human stem cells, which is a standard laboratory technique but raises concerns about whether the cells will be suitable for transplanting into people. And because the cell lines are in private hands, intellectual property issues must be resolved before government-financed scientists can work with them."

----- End Quote -----

A month later, an Associated Press news article repeated the claims made by President Bush's critics, with this paragraph:

----- Begin Quote -----

"After weeks of deliberation, Bush announced in August that he would permit research only on stem cell lines that he said already existed. Critics said they believed Bush overstated the number of lines, or cell colonies, and said many of them would prove unsuitable for use by scientists."

----- End Quote -----

As I stated a moment ago, while some of you may be under the impression that George W. Bush fulfilled his pledge to those who voted for him, (such as America's Christian Right), and put a stop to embryonic stem cell research, this is certainly not true. No sooner had Bush announced his decision regarding embryonic stem cell research on American national television, and signed his executive order, that the pro embryonic stem cell research proponents in Congress, such as Senators Arlen Specter, Orrin G. Hatch, Edward M. Kennedy, John Kerry, Bill Frist, Tom Harkin, Hillary Rodham Clinton and Lamar Alexander began to discuss ways to expand on President Bush's executive order, and to try to find legal loopholes around it. And so, in an October 2001 article in the New York Times, we find these opening paragraphs which reveal their strategy:

----- Begin Quote -----

The White House is expressing initial opposition to Senate legislation that would explicitly allow limited, federally financed stem cell research for the first time.

The Senate Appropriations Committee planned to vote Thursday on a routine spending bill that includes the provision. A subcommittee of that panel approved the overall measure Wednesday.

The language, written by Sen. Arlen Specter, R-Pa., would let President Bush follow through on his proposal to restrict the research to the 64 stem cell lines that he said already exist.

It also would permit him to go further, as long as the embryos used for the research otherwise would be destroyed and permission for their use had been granted by the people

whose fertility treatments created them.

----- End Quote -----

In short, they were trying to nudge Bush even further in his position, so that he would be willing to open the door for federally financed embryonic stem cell research just a little more. Let's jump forward now three years to May of 2004. As you will see, the attempt by George W. Bush to limit US stem cell research to the sixty-four known stem cell lines which were available around the world at that time was an exercise in futility. A CNN news article, dated May the 19th, 2004, opens with these paragraphs:

----- Begin Quote -----

The world's first embryonic stem cell bank opened in Britain on Wednesday, breaking new ground in one of the most controversial areas of medical research.

The bank aims to store and supply stem cell lines -- strings of identical cells -- for research and possible treatment of conditions like diabetes, cancer and Parkinson's. Its store of cell lines is expected to number tens of thousands.

But opponents say such research involves the "wanton creation and destruction of human life'' and have condemned the bank as a storage site for dead babies.

----- End Quote -----

In April and June of that same year, 2004, certain members of the US Congress again tried to bend President Bush's arm, as can be seen by this news clip from the Associated Press. Notice again that Bush's critics are using the very same tactic as in earlier years, and are claiming that the stem cell lines that Bush made available to American researchers in his August 2001 executive order, were unviable:

----- Begin Quote -----

Fifty-eight senators are asking President Bush to relax federal restrictions on stem cell research, and several said Monday that the late President Reagan's Alzheimer's disease underscored a need to expand the research using human

embryos.

The senators' letter to Bush was sent Friday, before Reagan died after a long struggle with Alzheimer's.

Bush signed an executive order in August 2001 limiting federal research funding for stem cell research to 78 embryonic stem cell lines then in existence.

But the letter complains that only 19 of those lines are now available to researchers and those available are contaminated with mouse feeder cells which makes their use for humans uncertain.

----- End Quote -----

Up until that point, President Bush appeared to be holding his ground, and the same article from the Associated Press stated in part:

----- Begin Quote -----

"The president remains committed to exploring the promise of stem cell research but at the same time continues to believe strongly that we should not cross a fundamental moral line by funding or encouraging the destruction of human embryos," Lisaius said.

"The president does not believe that life should be created for the sole purpose of destroying it. He does believe we can explore the promise and potential of stem cell research using the existing lines of stem cells."

----- End Quote -----

The very next month, in July 2004, in their efforts to keep up the pressure on President Bush, Senator Orrin G. Hatch, who as I noted earlier is a supporter of embryonic stem cell research, made the claim that the Senate had the necessary votes to end the filibuster surrounding embryonic stem cell research. An Associated Press news article stated in part:

----- Begin Quote -----

"Sen. Orrin Hatch, a Republican supporter of embryonic stem

cell research, said Sunday there is wide support in the Senate to ease the Bush administration's restrictive policy."

"Hatch said supporters have more than the 60 votes needed to end a filibuster, but he's unsure whether Congress would act 'in this hot political atmosphere'."

----- End Quote -----

So as we have now seen, the minute that George W. Bush signed the executive order which put a stop to federal financing for embryonic stem cell research, some members of the US Congress began looking for ways to weaken, and to eventually nullify, the president's order. The next year, in 2005, the House of Representatives tried to pass a veto-proof bill which would expand federal funding for embryonic stem cell research; but they were unable to muster the required number of votes, and the bill passed by a vote of 238 to 194. Demonstrating their strong opposition to Mr. Bush's position on the issue, fifty Republicans supported the bill. But a year later, in July of 2006, the results were a little different. As was reported by the Associated Press and other news services, the U.S. Senate unanimously approved a bill to expand federal funding for embryonic stem cell research, while the same bill floundered in the House of Representatives by a vote of 273-154. An AP news article begins with these opening paragraphs:

----- Begin Quote -----

The Senate voted Tuesday after two days of emotional debate to expand federal funding of embryonic stem cell research, sending the measure to President Bush for a promised veto that would be the first of his presidency.

The bill passed 63-37, four votes short of the two-thirds majority that would be needed to override Bush's veto. The president left little doubt he would reject the bill despite late appeals on its behalf from fellow Republicans Nancy Reagan and Arnold Schwarzenegger.

"The simple answer is he thinks murder's wrong," said White House spokesman Tony Snow. "The president is not going to get on the slippery slope of taking something living and making it dead for the purposes of scientific research."

----- End Quote -----

As was expected, the very next day, President Bush vetoed the bill, and House Majority Leader, John Boehner, noted that the House of Representatives would reinforce the vetoed bill when it was returned to them. In his remarks concerning the veto, President Bush stated in part:

----- Begin Quote -----

"This bill would support the taking of innocent human life in the hope of finding medical benefits for others."

"Each of these children was still adopted while still an embryo and has been blessed with a chance to grow, to grow up in a loving family. These boys and girls are not spare parts."

"They remind us of what is lost when embryos are destroyed in the name of research. They remind us that we all begin our lives as a small collection of cells. And they remind us that in our zeal for new treatments and cures, America must never abandon our fundamental morals."

"As science brings us every closer to unlocking the secrets of human biology, it also offers temptations to manipulate human life and violate human dignity. Our conscience in history as a nation demand that we resist this temptation."

"America was founded on the principle that we are all created equal and endowed by our creator with the right to life . . . We can advance the cause of science while upholding this founding promise. We can harness the promise of technology without becoming slaves to technology. And we can ensure that science serves the cause of humanity, instead of the other way around."

"Once [the line is] crossed, we would find it impossible to turn back."

----- End Quote -----

Of course, as in previous cases, certain Congressmen made clear their intention to continue the fight, until federal funding restrictions were removed from embryonic stem cell

research endeavors. In particular, Senator Orrin Hatch said that the president's veto "sets back embryonic stem cell research another year or so"; and Bill Frisk, the Senate Majority Leader, also stated:

----- Begin Quote -----

"I am pro-life, but I disagree with the president's decision to veto the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act . . . Given the potential of this research and the limitations of the existing lines eligible for federally funded research, I think additional lines should be made available."

----- End Quote -----

The Bush Administration did suffer one defeat at that time, when another bill they tried to push through Congress, which would have encouraged stem cell research from sources other than embryos, was defeated by the House of Representatives. However, there was another success for President Bush. Both the House of Representatives, and the US Senate unanimously approved a bill to ban "fetal farming". This is the practice of raising, and aborting, fetuses for scientific research, such as are used with embryonic stem cell research. Bush, of course, signed the bill into law.

What I personally find strange about these issues, is that there are certain Republicans who one might think run with the typical conservative herd, by the mere fact that they are Republicans, (and indeed, they do paint themselves as conservative before the public eye), but then you discover that they aren't quite as conservative as you were led to believe.

A case in point is California Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger. While Schwarzenegger is indeed a Republican, he not only supported the bill to expand federal funding for embryonic stem cell research, but he in fact wrote to Bush and asked him not to veto Bill H.R. 810. Of course, with two liberal Jewesses, as well as a liberal Roman Catholic in Congress, not to mention Schwarzenegger's own career as an actor who readily accepted a number of liberal acting roles, plus the very liberal nature of Hollywood -- which I personally refer to as Unholywood -- and all of the other liberal causes that come out of California, it should really come as no surprise

that Schwarzenegger would adopt this position. In comparing current developments in the New England states and the state of California, one has to wonder if they might not be having this private war to determine who can be the most liberal.

Another example where we find a Republican who is apparently not so conservative, is Nancy Reagan, the wife of former US President, Ronald Reagan. She likewise has supported the efforts to expand embryonic stem cell research in the United States. While I can certainly understand how the former First Lady has been affected by the plight, and death, of her late husband, nevertheless, as President Bush stated, there are certain moral bounds which we must never cross as Christians.

With this latest attack against his executive order, Mr. Bush was once again forced to declare his position to the American public. Thus, in addition to the previous comments, the White House spokesman, Tony Snow, also stated "The president is not opposed to stem cell research, he's all for it". Roy Blunt, the House Majority Whip, clarified the President's statement when he added "We must draw the ethical line at research that destroys human life". In other words, George W. Bush supports stem cell research, only when it does not involve the use of live human embryos. As you will see shortly, there are other less controversial methods now available, which avoid these hotly-debated moral issues, and they don't rely upon using human embryos at all.

About a month after President Bush vetoed the aforementioned bill, the American press revealed that a new technique had been developed, whereby stem cells could be harvested without destroying the days-old embryo. Through a scientific process referred to as "preimplantation genetic diagnosis", doctors at Advanced Cell Technology, and elsewhere, can remove a cell called a "blastomere"; that is, one of the eight cells from a two-day-old embryo, in order to check it for possible genetic defects. According to reports, this doesn't affect the health of the remaining seven cells. However, as was duly noted by the Bush Administration, and other critics of the technique, the very fact that the process involves using human embryos, still calls into question the morality of the practice. One typical reaction came from Brian Hart, who is a spokesman for Senator Sam Brownback of Kansas. He stated “You are creating a twin and then killing that twin". Of course, the Liberal Left was again quick to criticize the Bush Administration's

new objections. Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts remarked:

----- Begin Quote -----

“It’s tragic that the current Republican Congress continues to rubber stamp the restrictions that deny federal funding for scientists engaged in medical research that could save or improve countless lives."

----- End Quote -----

In June of 2007, the American mass media again revealed that Japanese scientists had found a way to create embryonic stem cells from the skin cells of mice. If it is true, and if it is a viable process which can also be conducted with human skin cells, this could possibly, and eventually, be a way to circumvent the moral issues which are directly connected to the practice of creating, and destroying, human embryos, in order to harvest embryonic stem cells. Just using that word "harvest" makes it sound so cold and calculating, but that is exactly what it is. As I have noted before, it basically amounts to destroying one life in order to attempt to save another.

Prior to the above announcement, the only way that scientists had found to convert adult cells into embryonic stem cells, was by using a controversial procedure referred to in medical circles as "therapeutic cloning". This procedure involves a process known as "nuclear transfer", whereby scientists must insert the nucleus of an adult cell into a female egg, whose own nucleus has been removed. Through a process which is not yet completely understood, the donor egg then reprograms the nucleus back into an embryonic state. As good as it sounds, to date, no one has yet succeeded in doing it. Furthermore, the fact that it still involves the use of human eggs, makes it a morally-questionable practice.

On the other hand, the new technique pioneered by Japanese scientists, (and reportedly reproduced by an American team), does not involve human eggs. Instead, they used a skin cell, into which were inserted four genes. From tests conducted thus far, it appears as if this new process offers the same results as nuclear transfer; however, the real challenge is to see if can be adapted to human skin cells, and not just

to mice cells. However, this new procedure is not completely without its risks and challenges. For example, the mice had to be interbred, (which obviously cannot be done with human beings); the skin cells had to be infected with a virus; and lastly, twenty per cent of the experimental mice died from skin cancer. Again, this is a totally unacceptable risk for human beings. In short, this technique is still rather far from being doable, or even morally acceptable, to a lot of people.

Not quite six months after the Japanese announced their new discovery, Roger Highfield of the Telegraph in Great Britain reported that Professor Ian Wilmut, (whose research team had created world-famous Dolly the sheep in 1996 at the Roslin Institute, near Edinburgh), was abandoning the processes of "therapeutic cloning" and "nuclear transfer". Instead, the professor had now become very excited about redirecting his attention to the new method, now being referred to as direct reprogramming, or "de-differentiation". Ironically, in the same week that Professor Wilmut made his announcement, the science journal "Nature" revealed that a team in Oregon had successfully used "therapeutic cloning" to create primate embryos. However, even the scientist in charge of the team, Doctor Shoukhrat Mitalipov, readily admitted that the method known as "therapeutic cloning" is wasteful, (it requires literally hundreds of eggs to create just two new stem cell lines), inefficient, and not very cost-effective. I would add to his remarks that it is also still morally repugnant to Bible-believing Christians.

What also has scientists excited about "de-differentiation", is the fact that there are rumors that Dr. Yamanaka and his team have also been successful with human skin cells, but simply have chosen not to reveal it yet. This rumor, as well as the fact that "de-differentiation" does not involve the use of human embryos in any form whatsoever, has some people very interested in this new technique, and some of them are already becoming convinced that "de-differentiation" will be the wave of the future, insofar as stem cell research is concerned.

Now, one would think that in light of these more acceptable developments revolving around "de-differentiation", a lot of American scientists would be quick to hop on the band wagon, and embrace it. To my dismay, in January of this same year,

(2008), the American mass media reported that despite the the moral complications which are associated with embryonic stem cell research, some scientists are still playing "God"; and a team in California has accomplished what others have been unable, or unwilling, to achieve; that is, they have used the somatic nuclear transfer procedure to create five-day-old embryos, for the purpose of extracting their stem cells for medical research. I find that unbelievable. Why in the world would they continue with a morally-unacceptable, wasteful, inefficient procedure, when something better has appeared on the horizon, which seems to offer more promise, and without the emotional baggage?

According to a report from MSNBC, a private company located in La Jolla, California, called Stemagen, has accomplished the feat. Of course, a lot of doubt has surrounded this news, due to the fact that about two years prior to this report, it was also announced that a Korean team led by Dr. Hwang woo-suk at Seoul National University, had achieved the very same task. As you may recall, no one was able to replicate their work, and eventually, to his own shame, and the shame of the entire Korean nation, Dr. Hwang woo-suk confessed that everything had been fabricated, and that there were no cloned human embryos. In the end, Dr. Hwang woo-suk resigned from his university position in disgrace. Well, I don't know what has happened to the work at Stemagen since that time, but according to the MSNBC news report:

----- Begin Quote -----

There are enough checks and balances reported in the paper - and a keen awareness by the authors of the fraud perpetrated by the South Korean group - to believe that they are really the first to achieve the cloning of human embryos in a verified, peer-reviewed process.

----- End Quote -----

As the article asks, if they really did do this, as seems to be the case, now what? Where do we go from here? My answer would have to be nowhere. Desist in this immoral activity at once, and respect the dignity of human life, as intended by our Creator. As to why these scientists still chose such a controversial method over "de-differentiation", the article offers an answer -- an unacceptable one in my view -- with

the following:

----- Begin Quote -----

With the appearance of some new scientific tricks to get adult cells to act more embryo-like, scientists, the president and a host of pundits declared the end of the long stem cell research battle. Not so fast. Not everyone thinks reprogramming adult cells to make them act like embryos is going to work. If you want to build your own repair kit to fix damaged heart muscle, torn nerves, severed spinal cords or worn-out joints, then cloning from your own healthy cells still strikes many as the way to go.

The California company is among those who see human cloning as the best source of stem cell repair kits.

----- End Quote -----

While the article is supportive of this reprehensible form of of research, it does readily admit that there are still some huge obstacles to overcome, such as the following:

----- Begin Quote -----

There is, however, a huge boulder in the path of companies like Stemagen who are betting on cloning to get them to the holy grail of stem cells that can be turned into curative cells. Where to get the eggs needed to make human embryonic clones?

In the paper announcing the breakthrough, the authors note that they got three out of 25 attempts at clones to turn into human clone embryos. That is a success rate of about 10 percent. Even if that success rate improves in the future, it still means that six or more eggs are going to be required for a researcher to make a stem cell from a clone made from the DNA of one of your own cells.

Where will hundreds of thousands of eggs come from when hundreds of thousands seek cures? Will we pay poor women to create them? Egg-farming, using powerful drugs with serious risks, may not be the most humane way to ask a poor woman to earn a living.

----- End Quote -----

One important question that we need to ask ourselves is this: Is there any truth to the wonderful promises which have been made regarding utilizing embryonic stem cell research to find medical cures for such life-threatening diseases as diabetes, cancer, Alzheimer's disease, Motor Neuron disease, etc.? And, even if there is, do they really validate the destruction of living human embryos, in order to achieve these results? The answer to both of these questions at this current time is a clear, resounding "No!". Our answer can be summed up in the following paragraph taken from a November 2004 article in the Agape Press:

----- Begin Quote -----

"In more than 20 years of research, he notes, not one malady or disease has been successfully treated or cured with embryonic stem cells, while more than 50 medical problems are already being treated successfully with adult stem cells."

----- End Quote -----

Now, some critics may complain that I have not asked a fair question. "Of course there are no cures just yet", they may retort. "It will take us years to reach a stage where we can even begin to develop these technologies". But you see, my question has perfect merit, when you understand the point I am making here. Please carefully notice that the previous paragraph makes two distinct statements. The last one is that the non-controversial method of using adult stem cells has in fact already provided treatments for fifty different medical problems, while embryonic stem cell research has provided not a single one. This claim is also backed up by information one can find on the Wikipedia website. It states in part:

----- Begin Quote -----

"Adult stem cells and cord blood stems cells have thus far been the only stem cells used to successfully treat any diseases. Diseases treated by these non-embryonic stem cells include a number of blood and immune-system related genetic diseases, cancers, and disorders; juvenile diabetes; Parkinson's; blindness and spinal cord injuries."

----- End Quote -----

Please go to part four for the conclusion of this series.

Written by Bill Kochman

wordweaver777@gmail.com
https://www.billkochman.com

Obama, McCain and the Bush Legacy - Part 4

Published On : November 6, 2008

Last Updated : October 4, 2024

Difficulty Of Using Embryonic Stem Cells To Cure Diseases, Stemgen Bypassed Bush's Executive Order Thru Private Funds, George Bush's Efforts Have Been Mostly Ineffective, Did We Really Get The Full Promised Package?, Where Are America's Righteous Leaders?, No Second Best Or Lesser Of Two Evils, Bush's Legacy Based On Two Wars And Global Economic Collapse? McCain And Bush Are Two Birds Of A Feather, McCain's Record On The Issues, George Bush Tied For Lowest Approval Rating, McCain Would Have Been Very Bad For America, Obama's Record On The Issues, Afro-Americans Have A Big Reason To Rejoice, Forty Years, God Raises Up And Puts Down National Leaders, Rejoice For Black America But Don't Support Obama's Views, To Vote Or Not To Vote, Meaning Of True Freedom And Democracy, A Non-Vote Is A Vote, Vote Of No-Confidence, I Couldn't Vote For McCain Or Obama, Obama's Victory Speech, No Real Choice, Surrendering Free Will, Political Correctness, Unpatriotic? How Effective Of A Leader Will Obama Be?, Chosen By God But For What Purpose? God Gives People The Leader They Deserve, Our Loyalty Is To God's Kingdom Only, We Are Strangers And Pilgrims Closing Remarks, BBB Suggested Reading List

Continuing our discussion from part three, this very same sentiment was expressed yet again in a November 2004 article

published in Newsweek International. It stated in part:

----- Begin Quote -----

". . . you might think that the chief obstacles to turning stem cells into cures were political. But the technical ones are legion. Stem cells taken from days-old embryos have the ability to produce any type of human cell, which makes them potentially so useful. But harnessing this ability has proved to be challenging. Left on their own, a clump of stem cells begins to form a hodgepodge of human cells, which won't do much to repair a damaged spinal cord. Scientists have had some success in using chemicals to direct stem cells to grow into various types of tissue, but the cells have an annoying tendency to disobey, preferring certain types of cells over others. Perhaps the cells get subtle cues from surrounding tissue? Nobody yet knows."

"Even if the levers were found to make stem cells grow into replacement parts, scientists would still have to get them to work together with surrounding cells. To be a functioning replacement for damaged brain or spinal-cord tissue, for instance, neurons grown from stem cells would have to connect to the body's neural networks."

"If these problems sound tough, consider that scientists at present don't really even know how to identify stem cells. They can test cells by injecting them into animal tissue to see if they form embryonic tissue, but such tests are cumbersome. Scientists would like a way to identify whatever DNA mechanism makes a cell a true stem cell, but they don't yet know what that might be."

----- End Quote -----

The above quotes again beg the question: If non-controversial and more promising techniques exist, such as using adult stem cells, and "de-differentiation", why do some companies such as Stemagen still insist on conducting embryonic stem cell research? Is it just some fanatical fascination with feeling empowered like some god, because they can create and destroy human life at will?

In case you didn't realize it, a few moments ago, I pulled the old "switcheroo" on you. What am I talking about? Well,

consider this: I just spent a major portion of this series explaining to you how President Bush has appeared to remain firm in his rejection of embryonic stem cell research for the past eight years. Bush has placed conservative-minded judges wherever he can, whenever he can, and he has beaten back those nasty pro embryonic stem cell research boys and girls in the US Congress whenever he can, by wielding the presidential power of the veto.

So the question is this: In light of everything that George W. Bush has done, how is it possible that Stemagen was able to achieve their task? Isn't this exactly what Bush has been trying to prevent over the past eight years? Sadly, just as with the abortion issue, and the gay and lesbian "marriage" issue, it appears that the American public was promised one package prior to his election, and even seemed to be getting that package with his two-time electoral victory, but in the end, it has never fully received the promised goods. In other words, technically-speaking, he kept his promise. Some would even say that he fought his hardest to prevent federal funds from being used to finance embryonic stem cell research. But you see, (and he obviously knew this all along), once he put up the legal roadblocks for federal funding, scientists who wanted to continue their research simply found other sources of financing, thus bypassing Bush's vetoes, and they broke no federal laws in the process.

In short, just as abortion is still the law of the land; and just as a pregnant minor can still obtain an abortion in some places without either parental consent or notification; and just as more gays and lesbians are now getting "married" than ever before, Bush's actions actually did very little to stop embryonic stem cell research. Scientists simply changed gears in light of the new situation, while the gullible American public has believed that Bush kept his word. After all, as I said, he did promise to hold back federal financing, and he did do that, as far as we know. Such is the shrewdness of all American politicians. They have the ability to make you think that they have done what you have asked of them, when all the while, they are doing something entirely different.

As I told our mailing list readers in February of 2007, the USA has very few righteous leaders left. They are all slowly becoming godless and corrupt; corrupted by power, by money, by powerful lobbyists, by self-interest and by fame. As God's

Word tells us:

"Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people."
Proverbs 14:34, KJV

"But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him."
Acts 10:35, KJV

A year and nine months ago, I asked our mailing list members what the American Christian Right was going to do during the 2008 presidential race. I predicted that as they had done during the George Bush/John Kerry race, they would probably end up choosing what they view as the lesser of two evils. They wouldn't find a worthy candidate, so they would settle for second best. But as I said earlier in this series, there really is no second best. Either a candidate is fully on the side of the Lord, and leads the nation by Christian example, and supports and promotes only Godly laws and principles, or else he doesn't.

While many American Christians voted for George W. Bush as a result of his publicly-stated position regarding the three key issues that we have examined in this series, and because they assumed that he would be a very Christian president, as we've now seen, if we dare to delve beyond surface impressions, and look deeper at these issues, George W. Bush has not been as effective in these three areas, as it would seem. I would like to say that perhaps Bush held back the tide of evil a little longer, but even that isn't true. In my view, in all three key areas, the situation has gotten worse during the past eight years. Millions of babies have continued to be aborted. Three states have now legalized gay and lesbian "marriages" whereas before there were none. Embryonic stem cell research has not been stopped, in spite of a lack of federal financing.

Add to the above America's two prolonged wars in which many thousands of people have died needlessly; and the fact that America is hated the world over more than ever before and is viewed as an oppressive bully and unilateralist; and the fact that the entire world is currently engulfed in a very serious recession such as it has not seen in many decades, which is a direct result of American greed; and the fact that George W. Bush has not come to the aid of the poor, the sick, the needy

the elderly, or the young; and one must truly wonder what his legacy will be? How will history remember him? I suspect that the two wars, as well as the global economic collapse, will play a greater role in determining how the world remembers George W. Bush. The other internal national issues will seem minor by comparison, particularly if you realize that a large part of the world is not even Christian, and so won't judge Bush by Christian standards.

Let us briefly return now to our discussion of Senator Barack Obama and John McCain. In spite of his current attempt to try to distance himself from George W. Bush, and paint himself as some sort of free-thinking "Renegade Republican" who will do a much better job as the next president of the United States, the truth of the matter is that John McCain will continue to implement some of the very same policies as Bush, because he and George Bush are basically of the same stock. McCain is a friend of the rich and the powerful, and has publicly stated that he would make the Bush tax cuts permanent. Like Mr. Bush, McCain is a gung-ho war-monger, and he has no intentions of quickly pulling American troops out of Iraq or anywhere else. In fact, his goal is to have American troops remain in Iraq until 2013. This is an individual who still relishes telling the story of his years of captivity as a POW in Viet Nam. War is simply in his blood. Some people say that he would even be worse than George W. Bush when it comes to a choice between pulling the trigger, or relying upon slower diplomacy. I can certainly see John McCain taking the war to Iran in the blink of an eye.

As far as the gay and lesbian agenda is concerned, as we saw earlier, John McCain was one of seven Senators who failed to support the gay "marriage" ban amendment. He was obviously very wrong to do so. Concerning abortion, John McCain is in favor of repealing Roe v. Wade. He has supported most bills related to restricting the current laws pertaining to this ungodly practice, such as banning partial birth abortions, prohibiting the practice of taking minors across state lines in order to obtain abortions, maintaining a ban on Military Base Abortions, supporting notifying the parents of a minor when said child obtains an abortion across state lines, etc. While John McCain voted yes to ban human cloning, in April of 2007, he also voted yes to expand research to more embryonic stem cell lines. In short, John McCain is a mixed bag of tricks, just like George W. Bush.

The idea of John McCain being even worse than Bush is a very interesting point. According to a New York Times article from October 30, 2008, President Bush's approval rating remains at twenty-two percent. According to the article, this makes Bush tied for the lowest presidential approval rating on record. President Harry S. Truman's approval rating was also a very low twenty-two per cent, according to a 1952 Gallup Poll. In an editorial from November 1, 2008, also taken from the New York Times, Op-Ed writer Nicholas D. Kristof states that:

----- Begin Quote -----

"An unscientific poll of 109 professional historians this year found that 61 percent rated President Bush as the worst president in American history."

"A couple of others judged him second-worst, after James Buchanan, whose incompetence set the stage for the Civil War. More than 98 percent of the historians in the poll, conducted through the History News Network, viewed Mr. Bush’s presidency as a failure."

----- End Quote -----

Had John McCain won the 2008 election, and if he were to have kept American troops in Iraq until 2013, as he had intentions to do, and if he were to have bombed Iran, I suspect that his approval rating would have quickly dropped to zero. The world at large would simply not tolerate such actions, and under a McCain Administration, America would be even more hated than it already is. Likewise, given current American opinions of the Iraq occupation, in a Democratic-controlled Congress, it may have even lead to McCain's possible impeachment. America needs healing, not more wars, and that may possibly be one of the few good things that will come from Mr. Obama's victory.

And what about Senator Barack Obama? Once all of the election season euphoria has worn off, and Mr. Obama has settled into his new position as the President of the United States, what should we expect? If past Democratic administrations are any indication, and if we look at Obama's seriously left-leaning voting record over the past several years, then there is no doubt that America can look forward to the promotion of some very liberal causes with which we as Christians simply don't

agree. Obama's public voting record, as well as his verbal record are quite clear. Consider the following points, and keep in mind that Vice President-elect Joseph Biden adheres to some of the very same positions. Among other things:

01. He supports Roe v. Wade.

02. He voted against prohibiting minors from crossing state lines in order to obtain an abortion.

03. He voted against notifying parents of minor children who obtain out-of-state abortions.

04. He voted in favor of expanding research to include more embryonic stem cell lines.

05. He is undecided on whether or not life begins at conception.

06. He voted against banning partial-birth abortions.

07. He stated that we should trust women to make their own decisions regarding partial-birth abortion.

08. He is opposed to a constitutional ban on gay and lesbian "marriage".

09. He believes that homosexual relationships are no more immoral than heterosexual relationships.

10. On one occasion, in reference to gay and lesbian marriages, he stated ". . . nor am I willing to accept a reading of the Bible that considers an obscure line in Romans to be more defining of Christianity than the Sermon on the Mount".

11. He opposes gay marriage, but supports civil unions and gay rights.

12. On one occasion, he remarked that he does not believe that being homosexual is a curse, and also stated "I do not believe being gay or lesbian is a choice".

13. He has been strongly opposed to the Iraq war since its inception.

At this moment, many people are rejoicing, particularly those who are of Afro-American heritage. After a long, hard battle, they indeed have a good reason to rejoice, and this is truly their moment, a historical moment which they should cherish, and which will never be taken from them. In a strange sort of way, this victory by Barack Hussein Obama and Black America has a certain prophetic nature to it; for it was forty years ago, that another Black man was gunned down in cold blood. As one Black man fell by an assassin's bullet, another has risen to take his place forty years later, powered by an undeniable electoral victory. As Christians, we must recognize that for whatever His reasons, the Lord has permitted this historical moment to occur; for to deny this, would be to deny His Holy Word, which clearly tells us that God is sovereign above all, and He sets up one leader, and puts down another, according to His Divine Will. Consider the following group of verses which verify this point:

"Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake."
Romans 13:1-5, KJV

"Lift not up your horn on high: speak not with a stiff neck. For promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south. But God is the judge: he putteth down one, and setteth up another."
Psalm 75:5-7, KJV

"Daniel answered and said, Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever: for wisdom and might are his: And he changeth the times and the seasons: he removeth kings, and setteth up kings: he giveth wisdom unto the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding:"

Daniel 2:20-21, KJV

"This matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the holy ones: to the intent that the living may know that the most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men."
Daniel 4:17, KJV

"I have made the earth, the man and the beast that are upon the ground, by my great power and by my outstretched arm, and have given it unto whom it seemed meet unto me."
Jeremiah 27:5, KJV

"The king's heart is in the hand of the LORD, as the rivers of water: he turneth it whithersoever he will."
Proverbs 21:1, KJV

"For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the LORD, he hath also rejected thee from being king. And Saul said unto Samuel, I have sinned: for I have transgressed the commandment of the LORD, and thy words: because I feared the people, and obeyed their voice. Now therefore, I pray thee, pardon my sin, and turn again with me, that I may worship the LORD. And Samuel said unto Saul, I will not return with thee: for thou hast rejected the word of the LORD, and the LORD hath rejected thee from being king over Israel."
1 Samuel 15:23-26, KJV

"And upon a set day Herod, arrayed in royal apparel, sat upon his throne, and made an oration unto them. And the people gave a shout, saying, It is the voice of a god, and not of a man. And immediately the angel of the Lord smote him, because he gave not God the glory: and he was eaten of worms, and gave up the ghost."
Acts 12:21-23, KJV

But what about us Christians? Should we too rejoice this day? Perhaps we can be happy in knowing that the hateful scourge of racism was defeated yesterday; and we can be happy because Black America is feeling vindicated today, but that is as far as it can go. From reading the previous points regarding Mr. Obama's record on the issues, it is obvious to me, as I hope

it is also obvious to you, that no true Bible-believing, God-fearing Christian can fully support Obama's views or programs, unless they are really deceived. Similarly, John McCain does not possess a record with which we Christians can fully agree either; so in my view, to have voted for him would be a clear betrayal of some of our most cherished beliefs. So as I have said so many times before, it doesn't really matter who would have won this election insofar as we Christians are concerned because we would've lost out either way; because no political candidate is ever fully on the Lord's side when it comes to the important issues.

Some of you reading this may now be protesting, "Now, wait a minute! What are you saying? That we simply shouldn't vote if none of the candidates meet our expectations as Christians?" Well, obviously, I cannot tell anyone how to vote, or even if they should vote. That is a very personal decision which you alone must make, based upon your personal belief system, and what you have learned about each of the candidates.

Having said that, let me ask you a simple question; and we will base it upon the current election. If you honestly don't agree with or like all of the positions which are embraced by a particular candidate, or by any of the candidates, then why in the world would you vote for any of them? In the USA, lots of people like to talk about freedom, democracy, the precious right to vote, etc.; but here is something which perhaps you have never considered: If you are forced to vote for someone, or feel pressured to vote for someone, even though you really don't want to, is that really freedom and democracy?

The way I look at it is this: If I don't like or agree with a person, or if I don't like or agree with the positions of any of the available candidates, then I am not going to vote for any of them. By not voting for one person, or for any of the candidates, I have in fact cast my vote. I have expressed my right as a free citizen. I have expressed both my voice, and my voting choice. In other words, I believe that a "non-vote" is in fact a vote. It is a vote of "no-confidence". It is a vote of protest against a corrupt political system, and it is a vote which says "I don't like or fully agree with any of you, and I am not going to compromise my Christian beliefs, just because I may agree with you on a few issues."

There's no way that I could have voted for an individual like

John McCain, who, like President Bush, not only is obviously a man of war, but who also would do very little to assist the sick, the elderly, the poor and the downtrodden. Furthermore, the fact that McCain voted against the federal amendment on gay "marriages", and also chose to support expanding federal financing for embryonic stem cell research, only served to further solidify my vote against him. In like fashion, there is no way on Earth that I could possibly have voted for a man like Barack Obama. While we were repeatedly informed that he is a Christian during the campaign, given the liberal ungodly nature of his campaign platform, his liberal voting record, and his obvious rejection of some of the core beliefs of our Christian faith, I seriously have to wonder how he can even dare to refer to himself as a Christian.

It might interest you to know that I sat here and listened to live ABC coverage of Obama's victory speech over the Internet. I was waiting, listening and hoping for something specific in his speech, which might give an indication that I was wrong about the man. Sadly, it never came. It was only at the very end of his speech, as he pronounced his parting words, that he said "God bless you all; God bless America!". Of course, that was not meant to be taken as a profession of faith. It was merely a popular, much over-used, meaningless political slogan which any candidate could have uttered.

Therefore, because of the aforementioned reasons, I remain fully convinced that neither McCain or Obama would have been a suitable wise choice for real Bible-believing, God-fearing Christians. It would have been a mistake for me to vote for either one of them; because by doing so, I would not only be giving him my support on the things that I agree with, but I would also be giving him the power to implement those things with which I do not agree. I would in effect become a willing accomplice to his sins against the Lord.

On the other hand, when you vote for someone even though you honestly don't agree with them on certain issues, as some of you obviously did, in my view, you have in fact surrendered your free will, and your right to choose, or not to choose. Perhaps without even realizing it, you have become a victim of political correctness. Why is that? Quite simply, because it has been bred into Americans over the years, that if you don't vote, then you must be unpatriotic. Maybe you are even one of those pinko commies. So rather than face being called

unpatriotic, you bow to pressure, to political correctness, and you go out and vote for someone, with whom you don't even fully agree. Now is that crazy or what?

Now, I want you to stop and think about something. Right now, this very minute, there must be literally dozens, hundreds, or perhaps even thousands of very intelligent people in the United States, who are qualified to lead the country. If a one-term Black Senator, with no foreign relations experience can be elected to the highest office in the land, then so can many other equally-qualified individuals. So why aren't they? Every four years, you as an individual are told that you must choose between just two men, and if you don't go out and vote for one of those two men, surely you must be unpatriotic. Can you see the controlling factor in all of this? While you are constantly being pounded with all of this talk of freedom and democracy, the truth of the matter remains that your freedom of choice is intentionally limited by the powers-that-be; and the power that they use is vast sums of money. One of the big reasons why Barack Obama won the election, is because he was able to shout longer, louder and in more areas, because of his basically unlimited financial reserves. Money, and not just his message, gave him the vote.

Now that Obama has won the election, I suspect that he may owe so many favors to so many different powerful people, that in spite of his good intentions, (at least from his liberal point of view), he may become just another ineffective puppet leader whose strings will be pulled by the rich and powerful, while the poor will continue to suffer, and the principles of the Bible will be trampled under foot. Even if Mr. Obama does retain the freedom to be his own man, the Bush Administration has created so many serious problems which he will have to address, and in short order, that even trying to fulfill some of his campaign promises may be easier said than done.

While I have stated that I believe that Barack Obama has won the election by God's Design, please do not misinterpret the meaning of my words. Just because the Lord has allowed Obama to win, does not mean that he's a good person, or will make a good leader for America. Quite to the contrary, as I pointed out a moment ago, we Christians really have little to rejoice over with Obama's landslide victory. As you can see from the verses I shared earlier, while the Lord gave the Israelites a king, because that is what they truly wanted, He realized in

advance that this is not what they truly needed. As a result, while He gave them the desire of their hearts, the Israelites later grew to regret their decision, as Saul was a terrible king, (just like Bush), and the Lord eventually rejected him. Saul was cursed, and he and his sons died in battle, as per the prophecy of the Prophet Samuel.

As I point out in other articles, you need to remember that God allows certain leaders to come to power for different reasons. Some may be blessings to their people, while others will be curses. Sometimes the Lord allows a particular person to come to power, simply so that He can use them to chastise the very people who have elected him to office. I have long believed that God gives the people the leader that they truly deserve, and Barack Obama is no exception to that rule. Black America may rejoice and the leaders of other nations may also rejoice, but it remains to be seen exactly what kind of king Obama will turn out to be. If there is one thing that can be said beyond a shadow of a doubt, it is that God has given a very liberal king to a supposedly Christian nation, which has has become increasingly liberal, and increasingly ungodly in its moral standards, as the years have progressed. Some of the developments of the past several years have certainly proved this point.

Regardless of what happens or does not happen during the next four years, as Christian believers, we must never forget that our loyalties must remain first and above all to the Kingdom of God. He is our Commander-In-Chief, and the One from whom we take our orders. As God's Word plainly teaches us, we are not of this world, and our Kingdom is not of this world. In light of these facts, we shouldn't participate in the affairs of the world, any more than what is absolutely necessary. If this seems like a strange doctrine to you, then I encourage you to consider the truth found in the following verses:

"If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you."
John 15:19, KJV

"Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you,"
2 Corinthians 6:17, KJV

"No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life; that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier."
2 Timothy 2:4, KJV

"These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city."
Hebrews 11:13-16, KJV

"Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God."
James 4:4, KJV

"Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever."
1 John 2:15-17, KJV

So as you can hopefully see, like our spiritual forefathers of old, we are strangers and pilgrims in this world, and we are merely passing through it, on our way to a much better Home in Heaven. The things of this current world will soon pass away, because they are temporal; or as the Apostle Paul once wrote, they are like wood, hay and stubble which will ultimately be burned by the purifying fires of the Lord's righteous Judgment. Only God, and His holy Kingdom, are truly eternal; and as I mentioned at the beginning of this series, one of these days, perhaps when we least expect it, all of the corrupt worldly kingdoms and nations of human invention will be smitten by the Rock from Heaven, as Jesus

Christ set ups His own righteous, literal Kingdom upon this Earth. Then, and only then, will all of the people of the world be treated righteously and fairly, because corrupt, partisan politics will have become a thing of the past; and there will only be God's politics. If you want a real reason to rejoice, I've just given you one. Think about it.

With these thoughts, I will bring this series to a close. It is my hope that you have found it informative, enlightening, and I pray that it has been a blessing in your life as well. If you have an account with Facebook, Twitter, Tumblr or with any other social network, I would really appreciate if you'd take the time to click or tap on the corresponding link that is found on this page. Thanks so much, and may God bless you abundantly!

For additional information and further study, you may want to refer to the list of reading resources below which were either mentioned in this series, or which contain topics which are related to this series. All of these articles are likewise located on the Bill's Bible Basics web server. To read these articles, simply click or tap on any link you see below.

From Armageddon to the New Earth
One From Beyond: Hebrew of Hebrews
Saddam Hussein's Execution and the Euro Dollar War
The Heavenly Vision: Have You Got It?
To Vote, or Not to Vote

Written by Bill Kochman

wordweaver777@gmail.com
https://www.billkochman.com